REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 11, 2008. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-12 and 14-21 were pending. Claims 1-12 and 14-21 were rejected. Claim 18 was objected to. Claims 1, 8, and 18 have been amended. Claim 17 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 13 and 22 were previously cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 8-12 and 14-21 were objected due to certain recited phrases that the Examiner recommended be replaced with alternative language. Applicants have amended Claims 8 and 18 accordingly, and therefore request the objection to Claims 8-12 and 14-21 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,892,249 issued to Raffi Codilian et al. ("*Codilian*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,750,864 issued to Mohammed S. Anwar ("*Anwar*").

Although Applicants believe independent Claims 1, 8, and 18 were allowable over the proposed combination of *Codilian* and *Anwar* prior to this Response, Applicants have amended in order to advance prosecution. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite, in part:

> 1. A method for communicating the consequences of a user preference setting on one or more related components regarding the performance of an information handling system, comprising:
>
> displaying a graphical first component control for a first component, the graphical first component control graphically displaying and allowing the user to graphically adjust a performance level setting for the first component within a range of performance level settings for the first component to effect a user preference setting concerning the first component;
>
> displaying a graphical second component control for the second component, the graphical second component control graphically displaying and allowing the user to graphically adjust a performance level setting for the second component within a range of performance level settings for the second component to effect a user preference setting concerning the second component;
>
> ...

displaying a first component value user interface allowing the user to enter a numerical performance level value for the first component; and

in response to receiving the numerical performance level value for the first component from the user:

automatically adjusting the graphical first component control to reflect the numerical performance level value for the first component received from the user; and

automatically adjusting the graphical second component control to reflect a performance level value for the second component corresponding to the numerical performance level value for the first component received from the user, based on a predefined relationship between the first and second components.

The proposed combination of *Codilian* and *Anwar* fails to disclose these elements. For example, neither *Codilian* nor *Anwar* disclose displaying a user interface for entering a numerical performance level value for the first component, and in response to receiving a numerical performance level value for the first component entered a user, automatically adjusting (a) a graphical control for the first component to reflect the user-entered_numerical performance level value; and (b) a graphical control for a second, related component to reflect a performance level value corresponding to the user-entered_numerical performance level value for the first component, based on a relationship between the first and second components.

As another example, neither *Codilian* nor *Anwar* disclose both (a) a graphical control allowing a user to graphically adjust a performance level setting for a particular component and (b) a user interface allowing the user to enter a numerical performance level value for the same particular component, much less automatically adjusting the graphical control based on a numerical value entered by a user.

Accordingly, proposed combination of *Codilian* and *Anwar* fails to disclose at least these elements of amended Claim 1 discussed above. For at least these reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 2-7 that depend from amended Claim 1. In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 8 and 18, as well as Claims 9-12, 14-18, and 19-21 that depend therefrom.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2689.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants

Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 33,790

Date: September 11, 2008

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER NO. **23640**
512.322.2689
512.322.8383 (fax)